



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,914	10/29/2003	John Ezell	030366	8225
7590 Philmore H. Colburn II Cantor Colburn LLP 55 Griffin Road South Bloomfield, CT 06002	08/22/2007		EXAMINER DARNO, PATRICK A	
			ART UNIT 2163	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/22/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/696,914	EZELL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patrick A. Darno	2163	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. No new claims have been added. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Claims 1-12 are pending in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,974,563 issued to Donald E. Beeler, Jr. (hereinafter “Beeler”).

Claim 1:

Beeler a method for synchronizing data in first and second computer servers (*Beeler: column 15, lines 46-48 and Fig. 26*), the first computer server including a first plurality of data sets each having a first identifier and a first set of attributes (*Beeler: Fig. 26, 260 and column 5, lines 44-48 and column 9, lines 33-36; Note that the entire contents of a first server's hard drive can be synchronized (mirrored) with a second server's hard drive. The content of a computer's hard drive contains a plurality of files. Furthermore, stored files contain at least one identifier (file name) and a plurality of attributes (size, date created, date modified, etc.). So it is clear that each server has data sets including at least a first identifier and some form of first attributes.*), and the second computer server including a second plurality of data sets each having a second identifier and a second set of attributes (*Beeler: Fig. 26, 262 and column 5, lines 44-48 and column 9, lines 33-36; Note that the Source Server is the 'first server' and the Target Server is the 'second server'.), the method comprising:*

modifying an attribute of one of the first plurality of data sets (*Beeler: column 12, lines 57-65*) and setting a checksum associated with one of the first plurality of data sets to a predetermined value (*Beeler: column 15, lines 53-56 and Fig. 33, 333*);

accessing one of the first plurality of data sets having a checksum set to the predetermined value and formatting at least one attribute associated with the one of the first plurality of data sets to predetermined format type (*Beeler: column 5, lines 8-13 and column 11, lines 5-8*);

transmitting a second identifier (*Beeler: Fig. 26, 263; The second identifier is FAST.DAT (263).*) and a second checksum value (*Beeler: Fig. 26, 265*) both associated with one of the second plurality of data sets to the first computer server (*Beeler: column 15, lines 46-48 and column 15, line 50 – column 16, line 7; Note specifically column 15, lines 56-58. The information (identifier and checksum) related to a data set that is to be synchronized is requested from the second server by the first server. The first server receives this information. It is clear that the second server transmitted this information. Since the information was stored in the second server, the identifier and checksum involved must be the second identifier and second checksum.*);

accessing one of the first plurality of data sets having a first identifier (*Beeler: Fig. 26, 261; The first identifier is FAST.DAT (261).*) corresponding to the transmitted second identifier to determine a first checksum value (*Beeler: Fig. 26, 264*) associated with the accessed data set (*Beeler: column 15, lines 46-48 and column 15, line 50 – column 16, line 7*); and,

when the first checksum value is not equal to the transmitted second checksum value (*Beeler: column 15, lines 58-61 and column 15, line 67 – column 16, line 7; Note that transmitting and replacing only takes place if the two checksum values are unequal (i.e., different).*), transmitting the one of the first

Art Unit: 2163

plurality of data sets from the first computer server to the second computer server to replace a second set of attributes of the one of the second plurality of data sets with the first set of attributes of the one of the first plurality of data sets (*Beeler: column 15, lines 58-61 and column 15, line 67 – column 16, line 7*).

Claim 2:

Beeler discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Beeler further discloses wherein the one of the first plurality of data sets includes the first set of attributes associated with one of a physical network element, a software event, and a logical operator (*Beeler: column 5, lines 44-48; Surely a file stored on a server is a data set, having attributes, associated with a physical network element. The file (data set) and its attributes are associated with the server (physical network element) because the file is stored on the server.*).

Claim 3:

Beeler discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Beeler further discloses wherein the first checksum value is calculated by the first computer server using the first set of attributes associated with the one of the first plurality of data sets (*Beeler: column 19, lines 4-7; Clearly the size of a data set is an 'attribute'. Note specifically that at least the size attribute is used in calculating the checksum.*).

Claim 4:

Beeler discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Beeler further comprising transmitting the first checksum value to the second computer server to replace the second checksum value in the second computer server with the first checksum value (*Beeler: column 15, line 67 – column 16, line 7; When the file is overwritten in the second (target) server, the first checksum*

Art Unit: 2163

value (from source) replaces the second checksum (stored in target) because now both the target version and the source version are both the same. If the files are the same, their checksums are equal.).

Claim 6:

Beeler discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Beeler further discloses wherein the first plurality of data sets includes at least one data set that does not correspond to any of the second plurality of data sets (*Beeler: column 19, lines 7-12*).

Claim 7:

Claim 7 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 8:

Claim 8 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 2.

Claim 9:

Claim 9 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 3.

Claim 10:

Claim 10 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 4.

Claim 12:

Claim 12 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2163

3. Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beeler and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,999,937 issued to Scott Ellard (hereinafter "Ellard").

Claim 5:

Beeler discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, but Beeler does not explicitly disclose wherein the one of the first plurality of data sets is formatted differently than the one of the second plurality of data sets.

However, Ellard discloses wherein the one of the first plurality of data sets is formatted differently than the one of the second plurality of data sets (*Ellard: column 3, lines 37-50 and Fig. 1*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Beeler with the teachings of Ellard noted above for the purpose of permitting a computer system to contain a first plurality of data sets which is formatted differently than a second plurality of data sets (*Ellard: column 3, lines 37-50 and Fig. 1*). The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the teachings of Beeler per the above in order to configure a computer system to automatically covert and transfer data from a first data format to a second data format (*Ellard: column 1, lines 29-31*). Configuring a computer system to automatically convert and transfer data from a first data format to a second data format provides the advantage of saving time involved, and reduces the chance of errors arising, in the conversion and transfer of data (*Ellard: column 1, lines 21-30*).

Claim 11:

Claim 11 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 5.

Conclusion

Applicant Argues:

There is no teaching in Beeler of "modifying an attribute of one of the first plurality of data sets and setting a checksum associated with one of the first plurality of data sets to a predetermined value; accessing one of the first plurality of data sets having a checksum set to the predetermined value and formatting at least attribute associated with the one of the first plurality of data sets to a predetermined format type" as recited in claim 1.

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. Beeler discloses modifying an attribute of one of the first plurality of data sets (*Beeler: column 12, lines 57-65*) and setting a checksum with one of the first plurality of data sets to a predetermined value (*Beeler: column 15, lines 53-56 and Fig. 33, 333*). Beeler also discloses accessing one of the first plurality of data sets having a checksum set to the predetermined value and formatting at least one attribute associated with the one of the first plurality of data sets to a predetermined format type (*Beeler: column 5, lines 8-13 and column 11, lines 5-8*).

Since it appears that the Beeler reference discloses each and every element of the Applicant's claimed invention, the rejections given above are upheld.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2163

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick A. Darno whose telephone number is (571) 272-0788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Patrick A. Darno
Examiner
Art Unit 2163

PAD

Patrick A. Darno
K. Wilson Lee
WILSON LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER